DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 617 TM 008 200

AUTHOR Mohr, E. Sue; Rumsey, Michael G.
TITLE Cadet Evaluation Battery: A Comparison of 1975 Male and Female Scores with One Another and with 1971 Male Scores. Technical Paper 330.
INSTITUTION Army Research Inst. for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Arlington, Va.
PUB DATE Sep 78
NOTE 21p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Females; Higher Education; *Leadership Qualities; Males; Norms; *Occupational Tests; *Officer Personnel; Personnel Selection; Scores; *Sex Differences; Trend Analysis; Vocational Aptitude; *Vocational Interests
IDENTIFIERS Army; *Cadet Evaluation Battery; *Reserve Officers Training Corps

ABSTRACT

The study compared male and female performance on the Cadet Evaluation Battery (CEB), a measure of Army officer potential, and compared male scores achieved in two testing periods 4 years apart. The CEB was administered to 637 male cadets in the second year of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) in 1971 and to 1,035 female and 926 male applicants in the third year of ROTC in 1975. Cognitive achievement scores from the 1971 sample were superior to the cognitive scores involving career potential, career intent, combat leadership, and technical-managerial leadership, for both the male and female 1975 samples. The noncognitive scores for the 1975 male group exceeded those for the 1971 group on three of four scales. These results were discussed in terms of changes in the nature of the ROTC population following the cessation of the draft. Comparisons between male and female scores indicated that females tended to perform as competently as males on the cognitive scales but revealed that male performance was superior on all four noncognitive scales. Discussion of the sex differences observed focused on the use of all-male samples in the development of the CEB. (Author/GDC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED164617

TM

Technical Paper 330

AD

CADET EVALUATION BATTERY: A COMPARISON OF 1975 MALE AND FEMALE SCORES WITH ONE ANOTHER AND WITH 1971 MALE SCORES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

E. Sue Mohr and Michael G. Rumsey

PERSONNEL ACCESSION AND UTILIZATION TECHNICAL AREA

TM008 200

U. S. Army
Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

September 1978

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

U. S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

A Field Operating Agency under the Jurisdiction of the
Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel

JOSEPH ZEIDNER
Technical Director

WILLIAM L. HAUSER
Colonel, US Army
Commander

NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION: Primary distribution of this report has been made by ARI. Please address correspondence concerning distribution of reports to: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, ATTN: PERI-P, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333.

FINAL DISPOSITION: This report may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

NOTE: The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER: Technical Paper 330
2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.:
3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER:

4. TITLE (and Subtitle): CADET EVALUATION BATTERY: A COMPARISON OF 1975 MALE AND FEMALE SCORES WITH ONE ANOTHER AND WITH 1971 MALE SCORES

5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED: --

6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER: --

7. AUTHOR(s): E. Sue Mohr and Michael G. Rumsey

8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s): --

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (PERI-IL), 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, Virginia 22333

10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS: 2Q763731A768

11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS: Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Washington, DC 20310

12. REPORT DATE: September 1978

13. NUMBER OF PAGES: 12

14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office): --

15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report): Unclassified

15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE:

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report): Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report): --

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES: --

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number):
Cadet Evaluation Battery (CEB)
Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC)
Cognitive and noncognitive measures
Sex differences
Officer selection test

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number):

The present study compared male and female performance on the Cadet Evaluation Battery (CEB), a measure of Army officer potential, and compared male scores achieved in two testing periods 4 years apart. The CEB was administered to 637 male cadets in the 2d year (Military Science II) of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) in 1971 and to 1,035 female and 926 male applicants in the 3d year of ROTC (MS III) in 1975. Cognitive scale scores from the 1971 sample were superior to the cognitive scores

20. Abstract (continued)
for both the male and female 1975 samples, while the noncognitive scores for the 1975 male group exceeded those for the 1971 group on three of four scales. These results were discussed in terms of changes in the nature of the ROTC population following the cessation of the draft. Comparisons between male and female scores from the 1975 samples indicated that females tended to perform as competently as males on the cognitive scales but revealed that male performance was superior on all four noncognitive scales. Discussion of the sex differences observed focused on the use of all-male samples in the development of the CEB.

Technical Paper 330

CADET EVALUATION BATTERY: A COMPARISON OF 1975 MALE AND FEMALE SCORES WITH ONE ANOTHER AND WITH 1971 MALE SCORES

E. Sue Mohr and Michael G. Rumsey

and

Anthony E. Castelnovo, Work Unit Leader

PERSONNEL ACCESSION AND UTILIZATION TECHNICAL AREA

Submitted as complete and technically accurate, by:
Ralph R. Canter
Technical Area Chief

Approved By:

E. Ralph Dusek, Director
INDIVIDUAL TRAINING AND PERFORMANCE RESEARCH LABORATORY

Joseph Zeidner
TECHNICAL DIRECTOR

U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333

Office, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel
Department of the Army

September 1978

Army Project Number
2Q763731A768

Officer Careers

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

ARI Research Reports and Technical Papers are intended for sponsors of R&D tasks and other research and military agencies. Any findings ready for implementation at the time of publication are presented in the latter part of the Brief. Upon completion of a major phase of the task, formal recommendations for official action normally are conveyed to appropriate military agencies by briefing or Disposition Form.

FOREWORD

The Personnel Accession and Utilization Technical Area of the Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) is concerned with providing integrated sets of techniques to support Army personnel management systems. Early identification of officer leaders and development of officer leadership from cadet training through company and field grade assignments are of major concern in the management of the Army's manpower resources. ARI conducts research to provide scientific means of identifying individuals with good leadership potential for officer training, selecting officers for commissioning, and evaluating their performance.

The Cadet Evaluation Battery (CEB) was developed as an end product of a program undertaken to meet the need for improving the selection and assignment of personnel in accord with their capabilities to meet differing leadership requirements. The program evolved in response to requirements and recommendations of the Army Scientific Advisory Panel (ASAP) and the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (DCSPER).

The CEB is essentially a refined and reduced version of the Differential Officer Battery (DOB). Technical Research Report 1173 presented the major psychological factors derived from officer responses to tests of the experimental DOB and described the reduction of the measures obtained to a manageable number of experimental predictor scores. Dimensions derived from a factor analysis of actions observed at an Officer Evaluation Center (OEC) simulation, which was developed to test the predictive validity of the DOB, are described in Technical Research Report 1172. Research Report 1182 examined the extent to which DOB scores were associated with differential performance in the OEC exercise and success in combat and technical/administrative assignments.

The transition from the experimental DOB test battery to the operational CEB battery necessitated the collection of normative data from the relevant cadet group. These data were collected on male students in the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps by Richard D. Doorley in 1971. The present publication uses normative data recently collected to compare male and female performances and compares these recent normative data with those collected in 1971. It carries forth the selection and assignment program responsive to the recommendations of ASAP and DCSPER as well as to the objectives of Army Project 2Q763731A768, FY 1977 Work Program.

JOSEPH ZEIDNER
Technical Director

CADET EVALUATION BATTERY: A COMPARISON OF 1975 MALE AND FEMALE SCORES WITH ONE ANOTHER AND WITH 1971 MALE SCORES

BRIEF

Requirement:

To compare male and female performance on the Cadet Evaluation Battery (CEB) and to examine changes in male CEB performance between 1971 and 1975.

Procedure:

The CEB was administered to 637 male cadets enrolled in the 2d year--Military Science (MS) II--of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) in 1971 and to 1,035 females and 926 males applying for enrollment into the 3d year (MS III) of ROTC in 1975. CEB scale and subscale scores were compared for all three samples.

Findings:

Cognitive scale scores from the 1971 sample were superior to the cognitive scores for both the male and female 1975 samples, whereas the noncognitive scores for the 1975 male group exceeded those for the 1971 group on three of four scales. The 1975 female sample achieved higher scores than the 1975 male sample on two of the three cognitive scales, but the 1975 male group was superior to the female sample on all four noncognitive scales.

Utilization of Findings:

The findings will (a) help determine the extent to which the CEB will be used for female cadets and the manner in which female CEB scores will be interpreted and (b) be used to establish new CEB norms.

CADET EVALUATION BATTERY: A COMPARISON OF 1975 MALE AND FEMALE SCORES WITH ONE ANOTHER AND WITH 1971 MALE SCORES

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
OBJECTIVES	2
METHOD	2
Subjects	2
Procedure	2
RESULTS	3
CONCLUSIONS	5
REFERENCES	9
DISTRIBUTION	11

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Raw mean scores and standard deviations on CEB scales for 1971 and 1975 samples	4
2.	t test comparisons of sample means	5
3.	Raw subscale means, standard deviations and t values for 1975 males and females	6

CADET EVALUATION BATTERY: A COMPARISON OF 1975 MALE AND FEMALE SCORES WITH ONE ANOTHER AND WITH 1971 MALE SCORES

INTRODUCTION

The Cadet Evaluation Battery (CEB) has been used operationally as a diagnostic measure of officer potential of cadets in the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) since 1972. The CEB consists of two primary parts: the Cadet Evaluation Test (CET) and the Cadet Evaluation Inventory (CEI). The CET provides a measure of the cadet's cognitive abilities in the areas of combat leadership, technical managerial leadership and career potential. The CEI provides a noncognitive measure of the cadet's interests in the same three areas as well as a measure of the cadet's career intent.

The CEB represents the culmination of a lengthy and comprehensive test development process. An early predecessor was the Differential Officer Leadership (DOL) Experimental Test Battery, which was administered experimentally to a male officer sample in 1958-1959. Based on the results of analyses on this sample, the DOL was refined to become the Differential Officer Battery (DOB) (Willemin, 1964). Factor analyses were conducted on individual tests or groupings of tests comprising the DOB (Helme, Willemin, & Day, 1971), followed by validational analyses based on an all-male sample in a simulated combat situation on the resulting scales (Helme, Willemin, & Day, 1974). The validational data were then used to select scales from four information tests, two self-description inventories (Differential Inventory-A and Differential Inventory-B), an attitudinal inventory (Individual Understanding Test), and a questionnaire on demographic and background information (Personal Data Record). Also, a new scale, based partly on items from an instrument entitled the Officer Assignment Questionnaire, was added. Items from these scales were combined to form the CEB, with the information tests providing the cognitive items and all other tests providing the noncognitive items.

The validational analyses on the DOB indicated that combat cognitive and noncognitive scales incorporated into the CEB were predictive of combat leadership performance, and that technical-managerial cognitive and noncognitive CEB scales were predictive of leadership performance in technical and managerial roles.

The career potential and career intent scales are used to predict whether the cadet will pursue an Army officer career.

OBJECTIVES

The content of CEB scales and means and standard deviations of CEB scale scores were determined on the basis of male samples. In recent years, females have been entering ROTC in increasing numbers; therefore, so that the CEB will be optimally useful for assessment and counseling of women, normative information regarding female CEB performance is needed. The present study was designed to provide such information. Also, because no standardization information on males had been collected since 1971, a new sample of males was tested for comparison with both the 1971 sample and the female sample.

METHOD

Subjects

In 1971, a sample of 637 male cadets enrolled in Military Science (MS) II from ROTC host institutions was tested.[1] These schools were representative in terms of academic level, cadet background, geographic area, and type (public, private, military).

The more recent samples comprised 1,035 female and 926 male applicants for MS III, including both advancing MS II cadets and 2-year program applicants, in FY 1975 (school year 1974-75). Units were instructed to return tests completed by all female applicants during FY 75 to ARI. Of a total of 291 units, 186 were identified as having sent tests for one or more female students. As some test information was not accompanied by an identifiable school code, the number of units contributing to this sample may have been somewhat higher. Also, among those not responding, approximately 30 schools had no females attending MS II during school year 1974-75. Many of these schools may simply have had no female applicants to MS III.

Male results were randomly selected from a complete file of all males taking the CEB in FY 1975 and also supplied to ARI.

Procedure

The CEB is a self-administered test battery developed by the Army Research Institute. This battery consists of two test booklets, 7 scales, and 23 subscales. One booklet, the CET, contains the following scales: Combat Leadership: Cognitive (CLC); Technical-Managerial Leadership: Cognitive (TMC); and Career Potential: Cognitive (CPC). The CLC scale is composed of two subscales: Tactics and Practical Skills.

---

[1] This data collection effort was conducted under the direction of Richard D. Doorley.

There are also two subscales for the TMC scale: History, Politics, and Culture, and Math/Physical Science. CPC is composed of a single subscale: Technology Operations.

The composition of the five CET subscales was determined by a factor analysis of the DOB information tests (Helme, 1968a). Four of the subscales (Practical Skills; History, Politics, and Culture; Math/Physical Science; and Technology Operations) emerged as factors in this analysis, while the fifth, Tactics, was a residual content scale.

The other booklet, the CEI, contains these scales: Combat Leadership: Noncognitive (CLN); Technical-Managerial Leadership: Noncognitive (TMN); Career Potential: Noncognitive (CPN), and Career Intent. CLN contains these subscales: Nature Endurance; Combat Engineer; Combat Leader; Physical Leader; Nonaesthetic; and Organized Sports and Outdoor Skills. TMN includes these: Decisive Leader; Verbal/Social Leader; Rural versus Urban; Scientific Interest; Scientific Orientation; and Math/Physical Science Interest. CPN subscales are Administrator Noninterest; Administrative Noninterest; Combat; and Manual versus White Collar Interest. Career Intent has but one subscale, Career Intent.

Of the 18 CEI subscales, 13 were derived from separate factor analyses on each of the two self-description inventories: Differential Inventory-A (Helme, 1968b) and Differential Inventory-B (Smith, 1968). Combat Leader and Scientific Orientation were factors on the Individual Understanding Test. Rural versus Urban Interest and Math/Physical Science Interest were derived from the Personal Data Record. Finally, Career Intent was based partly on the Officer Assignment Questionnaire and partly on newly developed items.

In 1975, two forms of the CEB were in operational use. All subjects sampled that year received Form 1. The CET, Form 1, contains 100 items with 4-response alternatives. The CEI, Form 1, contains 125 items which have 2-, 3-, 4-, or 5-response alternatives. Nine CEI items are not scored.

Subjects in the 1971 sample received an experimental form of the CEB. Items scored on this form were identical to those scored on Form 1. The CEB was administered to students at the local ROTC units.

RESULTS

Standard deviations and mean scores for the 1971 sample and the 1975 male and female samples were computed for each scale (see Table 1). Results of t tests comparing group means on each scale are shown in Table 2. Male means for 1971 were significantly different ($p < .005$) from male means for 1975 for each of the seven scales. On each of the three cognitive scales, the performance of 1971 group was superior. On all noncognitive scales except Career Potential the 1975 group achieved higher scores.

Table 1

Raw Mean Scores and Standard Deviations on CEB Scales for 1971 and 1975 Samples

Scale	1971 males (n = 637) M	1971 males (n = 637) S.D.	1975 males (n = 926) M	1975 males (n = 926) S.D.	1975 females (n = 1,035) M	1975 females (n = 1,035) S.D.
Combat Leadership: Cognitive (CLC)	21.59	5.03	18.07	6.80	16.80	4.86
Technical-Managerial Leadership: Cognitive (TMC)	22.42	6.02	16.91	6.53	18.74	5.70
Career Potential: Cognitive (CPC)	10.18	3.56	7.82	4.05	8.06	2.83
Combat Leadership: Noncognitive (CLN)	23.48	6.33	25.84	5.71	19.44	6.11
Technical-Managerial Leadership: Noncognitive (TMN)	21.77	6.54	22.72	5.54	21.85	6.10
Career Potential: Noncognitive (CPN)	14.56	6.23	13.45	5.16	10.54	5.37
Career Intent (CI)	3.63	2.50	5.34	1.94	5.03	2.06

Table 2

t Test Comparisons of Sample Means

Scale	High rank (1)	Medium rank (2)	Low rank (3)	t value (1)-(2)	t value (2)-(3)	t value (1)-(3)
CLC	1971	1975M	1975F	11.14**	4.85**	24.84**
TMC	1971	1975F	1975M	12.54**	6.70**	16.90**
CPC	1971	1975F	1975M	13.45**	1.55*	11.88**
CLN	1975M	1971	1975F	7.69**	12.95**	24.15**
TMN	1975M	1975F	1971	3.48**	.25	3.09**
CPN	1971	1975M	1975F	3.84**	12.33**	13.96**
CI	1975M	1975F	1971	3.48**	12.39**	15.20**

*p < .10.
**p < .005.

Comparisons between the 1975 females and the 1971 males revealed a significant ($p < .005$) superiority for males on five of the seven scales. On one scale, Technical-Managerial: Noncognitive, no significant differences were found; on Career Intent, the female scores were significantly ($p < .005$) higher.

Scores from the 1975 male sample were significantly ($p < .005$) higher than female scores on all four noncognitive scales. Males also scored significantly ($p < .005$) higher than females on the cognitive combat leadership scale, while females scored higher ($p < .005$) on the cognitive technical-managerial scale. Females also scored higher on the cognitive career potential scale, but the difference was not significant ($.05 < p < .10$).

Means for the 1975 male and female groups were computed and compared, using t tests for each subscale, as shown in Table 3. Male and female scores differed significantly ($p < .05$) on 18 of 23 subscales; of these 18 differences, 15 favored males and 3 favored females.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The most striking result that emerges from a comparison of the 1971 sample with the 1975 samples is the recent deterioration on the cognitive scales. Although some of the items used have probably become obsolete since their incorporation into the DOL in the 1950's, such obsolescence was probably almost as evident in 1971 as in 1975. An

Table 3

Raw Subscale Means, Standard Deviations, and t Values for 1975 Males and Females

Subscale (by scale)	Males (n = 926) M	Males (n = 926) S.D.	Females (n = 1,035) M	Females (n = 1,035) S.D.	t value
I. CLC					
Tactics	8.55	3.62	8.26	2.69	2.03*
Practical Skills	9.53	3.86	8.53	3.18	6.34*
II. TMC					
Hist/Pol/Culture	8.60	3.41	9.31	3.36	4.64*
Math/Phys. Sci.	8.32	3.99	9.43	3.23	6.80*
III. CPC					
Technology Op.	7.82	4.05	8.06	2.83	1.53
IV. CLN					
Nature Endurance	3.68	1.14	3.53	1.23	2.79*
Combat Engineer	4.41	2.20	2.12	2.09	23.62*
Combat Leader	2.40	1.09	2.27	1.17	2.54*
Physical Leader	3.40	1.31	3.40	1.22	--
Nonaesthetic	2.79	1.50	1.91	1.41	13.38*
Org. Sports	3.21	1.24	3.12	1.28	1.58
Outdoor Skills	5.97	2.00	3.41	2.19	26.91*
V. TMN					
Decisive Leader	6.88	2.00	6.70	2.28	1.85
Verbal/Social Ldr.	6.11	2.02	6.50	2.16	4.11*
Rural vs. Urban	3.16	1.20	3.13	1.26	.54
Sci. Interest	2.10	1.22	1.90	1.16	3.72*
Sci. Orientation	1.85	.89	1.57	.96	6.67*
Math/Phys. Sci. Interest	2.63	2.11	2.04	1.81	6.67*
VI. CPN					
Administrator Noninterest	3.47	2.00	3.01	2.09	4.96*
Administrative Noninterest	3.87	2.44	3.43	2.38	4.04*
Combat	4.08	2.19	2.35	2.14	17.67*
Manual vs. White Collar Int.	2.03	1.20	1.76	1.23	4.91*
VII. CI					
Career Intent	5.34	1.94	5.03	2.06	3.42*

[a]Percentile value of mean female score based on male norms.
*$p < .05$.

effort is currently in progress to replace questionable items. A more important factor may well have been the change in composition of the ROTC MS II population between 1971 and 1975. In 1971 the draft, by removing the nonmilitary job options of many college students, made ROTC a relatively attractive choice for many who might not otherwise have considered it. The competition for the limited number of ROTC spaces may well have produced a higher level of academic quality than in 1975, when the draft was no longer a factor.

It should be noted that the 1975 sample included applicants to the 2-year ROTC program as well as cadets enrolled in MS II. An exposure to ROTC courses might be expected to improve scores on the combat cognitive scale, which has a number of items on military tactics. However, such exposure would have no apparent effect on the technical-managerial cognitive scale, which is composed of history/politics/culture and math/physical sciences subtests. Because the cognitive technical-managerial scores declined to an even greater extent than the cognitive combat scores between 1971 and 1975, it does not appear that the inclusion of 2-year applicants was primarily responsible for the overall cognitive score deterioration.

Comparisons between the 1971 and 1975 male groups on the noncognitive scales revealed a trend markedly different from that found in comparisons of the cognitive scales. On each noncognitive scale except career potential, scores indicated that the 1975 group tended to have more of the interests found to correlate with successful on-the-job performance than the 1971 group. These findings are again consistent with an explanation based on the changing composition of the ROTC population between 1971 and 1975. A likely impact of the draft was to produce an ROTC population with relatively heterogeneous interests in 1971, which paralleled the interests of active military officers to a somewhat limited degree. With the draft eliminated by 1975, students with traditional military interests were more prevalent in the ROTC population. This explanation is consistent with the finding that the 1975 group demonstrated more motivation for a military career than the 1971 group on the career intent scale.

Comparisons between male and female scores from the 1975 samples indicated that females tended to perform as competently as males on the cognitive scales but did not perform as well on the noncognitive scales.

Although the reliance on voluntary cooperation of schools in obtaining data on females raised the possibility of response bias, a sufficiently large proportion of schools did respond to indicate that the female sample mean obtained here was a fairly reasonable estimate of the population mean for female applicants to the ROTC Advanced Course in 1975.

Any interpretation of the results for females must recognize that efforts to select and validate CEB items were conducted using male samples. Thus the noncognitive items selected indicated what interests and preferences are characteristic of a successful male officer, but these may not correspond exactly to the interests and preferences of a successful female officer. It cannot, then, be concluded that the noncognitive scores show that male ROTC students are more likely to be successful officers than female ROTC students.

Research is currently in progress to validate the CEB on females, using the 1975 sample. Until the results of this investigation are available, interpretations of female noncognitive scores must be made with special caution. The results on the cognitive scales provide at least a preliminary indication that the operational use of these scales does not place female cadets at an unfair disadvantage.

REFERENCES

Helme, W. H. Factorially Derived Information Measures for Differential Prediction of Officer Performance. ARI Technical Research Note 203, December 1968. (NTIS No. AD 686 288)

Helme, W. H. Factor Analysis of Leadership Inventory for Differential Prediction of Officer Performance. ARI Research Memorandum 68-8, July 1968.

Helme, W. H., Willemin, L. P., & Day, R. W. Psychological Factors Measured in the Differential Officer Battery. ARI Technical Research Report 1173, July 1971. (NTIS No. AD 737 685)

Helme, W. H., Willemin, L. P., & Grafton, F. C. Prediction of Officer Behavior in a Simulated Combat Situation. ARI Research Report 1182, March 1974. (NTIS No. AD 779 445)

Smith, K. H. Internal Analysis of Personal Inventory for the Differential Officer Battery. ARI Research Memorandum 68-5, April 1968.

Willemin, L. P. Prediction of Officer Performance. ARI Technical Research Report 1134, March 1964.

DISTRIBUTION

ARI Distribution List

4 OASD (M&RA)
2 HQDA (DAMI-CSZ)
1 HQDA (DAPE-PBR
1 HQDA (DAMA-AR)
1 HQDA (DAPE-HRE-PO)
1 HQDA (SGRD-ID)
1 HQDA (DAMI-DOT-C)
1 HQDA (DAPC-PMZ-A)
1 HQDA (DACH-PPZ-A)
1 HQDA (DAPE-HRE)
1 HQDA (DAPE-MPO-C)
1 HQDA (DAPE-DW)
1 HQDA (DAPE-HRL)
1 HQDA (DAPE-CPS)
1 HQDA (DAFD-MFA)
1 HQDA (DARD-ARS-P)
1 HQDA (DAPC-PAS-A)
1 HQDA (DUSA-OR)
1 HQDA (DAMO-RQR)
1 HQDA (DASG)
1 HQDA (DA10-PI)
1 Chief, Consult Div (DA-OTSG), Adelphi, MD
1 Mil Asst. Hum Res, ODDR&E, OAD (E&LS)
1 HQ USARAL, APO Seattle, ATTN: ARAGP-R
1 HQ First Army, ATTN: AFKA-OI-TI
2 HQ Fifth Army, Ft Sam Houston
1 Dir, Army Stf Studies Ofc, ATTN: OAVCSA (DSP)
1 Ofc Chief of Stf, Studies Ofc
1 DCSPER, ATTN: CPS/OCP
1 The Army Lib, Pentagon, ATTN: RSB Chief
1 The Army Lib, Pentagon, ATTN: ANRAL
1 Ofc, Asst Sect of the Army (R&D)
1 Tech Support Ofc, OJCS
1 USASA, Arlington, ATTN: IARD-T
1 USA Rsch Ofc, Durham, ATTN: Life Sciences Dir
2 USARIEM, Natick, ATTN: SGRD-UE-CA
1 USATTC, Ft Clayton, ATTN: STETC-MO-A
1 USAIMA, Ft Bragg, ATTN: ATSU-CTD-OM
1 USAIMA, Ft Bragg, ATTN: Marquat Lib
1 US WAC Ctr & Sch, Ft McClellan, ATTN: Lib
1 US WAC Ctr & Sch, Ft McClellan, ATTN: Tng Dir
1 USA Quartermaster Sch, Ft Lee, ATTN: ATSM-TE
1 Intelligence Material Dev Ofc, EWL, Ft Holabird
1 USA SE Signal Sch, Ft Gordon, ATTN: ATSO-EA
1 USA Chaplain Ctr & Sch, Ft Hamilton, ATTN: ATSC-TE-RD
1 USATSCH, Ft Eustis, ATTN: Educ Advisor
1 USA War College, Carlisle Barracks, ATTN: Lib
2 WRAIR, Neuropsychiatry Div
1 DLI, SDA, Monterey
1 USA Concept Anal Agcy, Bethesda, ATTN: MOCA-WGC
1 USA Concept Anal Agcy, Bethesda, ATTN: MOCA-MR
1 USA Concept Anal Agcy, Bethesda, ATTN: MOCA-JF
1 USA Artic Test Ctr, APO Seattle, ATTN: STEAC-MO-ASL
1 USA Artic Test Ctr, APO Seattle, ATTN: AMSTE-PL-TS
1 USA Armament Cmd, Redstone Arsenal, ATTN: ATSK-TEM
1 USA Armament Cmd, Rock Island, ATTN: AMSAR-TDC
1 FAA-NAFEC, Atlantic City, ATTN: Library
1 FAA-NAFEC, Atlantic City, ATTN: Hum Engr Br
1 FAA Aeronautical Ctr, Oklahoma City, ATTN: AAC-44D
2 USA Fld Arty Sch, Ft Sill, ATTN: Library
1 USA Armor Sch, Ft Knox, ATTN: Library
1 USA Armor Sch, Ft Knox, ATTN: ATSB-DI-E
1 USA Armor Sch, Ft Knox, ATTN: ATSB-DT-TP
1 USA Armor Sch, Ft Knox, ATTN: ATSB-CD-AD
2 HQUSACDEC, Ft Ord, ATTN: Library
1 HQUSACDEC, Ft Ord, ATTN: ATEC-EX-E-Hum Factors
2 USAEEC, Ft Benjamin Harrison, ATTN: Library
1 USAPACDC, Ft Benjamin Harrison, ATTN: ATCP-HR
1 USA Comm-Elect Sch, Ft Monmouth, ATTN: ATSN-EA
1 USAEC, Ft Monmouth, ATTN: AMSEL-CT-HDP
1 USAEC, Ft Monmouth, ATTN: AMSEL-PA-P
1 USAEC, Ft Monmouth, ATTN: AMSEL-SI-CB
1 USAEC, Ft Monmouth, ATTN: C, Facl Dev Br
1 USA Materials Sys Anal Agcy, Aberdeen, ATTN: AMXSY-P
1 Edgewood Arsenal, Aberdeen, ATTN: SAREA-BL-H
1 USA Ord Ctr & Sch, Aberdeen, ATTN: ATSL-TEM-C
2 USA Hum Engr Lab, Aberdeen, ATTN: Library/Dir
1 USA Combat Arms Tng Bd, Ft Benning, ATTN: Ad Supervisor
1 USA Infantry Hum Rsch Unit, Ft Benning, ATTN: Chief
1 USA Infantry Bd, Ft Benning, ATTN: STEBC-TE-T
1 USASMA, Ft Bliss, ATTN: ATSS-LRC
1 USA Air Def Sch, Ft Bliss, ATTN: ATSA-CTD-ME
1 USA Air Def Sch, Ft Bliss, ATTN: Tech Lib
1 USA Air Def Bd, Ft Bliss, ATTN: FILES
1 USA Air Def Bd, Ft Bliss, ATTN: STEBD-PO
1 USA Cmd & General Stf College, Ft Leavenworth, ATTN: Lib
1 USA Cmd & General Stf College, Ft Leavenworth, ATTN: ATSW-SE-L
1 USA Cmd & General Stf College, Ft Leavenworth, ATTN: Ed Advisor
1 USA Combined Arms Cmbt Dev Act, Ft Leavenworth, ATTN: DepCdr
1 USA Combined Arms Cmbt Dev Act, Ft Leavenworth, ATTN: CCS
1 USA Combined Arms Cmbt Dev Act, Ft Leavenworth, ATTN: ATCASA
1 USA Combined Arms Cmbt Dev Act, Ft Leavenworth, ATTN: ATCACO-E
1 USA Combined Arms Cmbt Dev Act, Ft Leavenworth, ATTN: ATCACC-CI
1 USAECOM, Night Vision Lab, Ft Belvoir, ATTN: AMSEL-NV-SD
3 USA Computer Sys Cmd, Ft Belvoir, ATTN: Tech Library
1 USAMERDC, Ft Belvoir, ATTN: STSFB-DQ
1 USA Eng Sch, Ft Belvoir, ATTN: Library
1 USA Topographic Lab, Ft Belvoir, ATTN: ETL-TD-S
1 USA Topographic Lab, Ft Belvoir, ATTN: STINFO Center
1 USA Topographic Lab, Ft Belvoir, ATTN: ETL-GSL
1 USA Intelligence Ctr & Sch, Ft Huachuca, ATTN: CTD-MS
1 USA Intelligence Ctr & Sch, Ft Huachuca, ATTN: ATS-CTD-MS
1 USA Intelligence Ctr & Sch, Ft Huachuca, ATTN: ATSI-TE
1 USA Intelligence Ctr & Sch, Ft Huachuca, ATTN: ATSI-TEX-GS
1 USA Intelligence Ctr & Sch, Ft Huachuca, ATTN: ATSI-CTS-OR
1 USA Intelligence Ctr & Sch, Ft Huachuca, ATTN: ATSI-CTD-DT
1 USA Intelligence Ctr & Sch, Ft Huachuca, ATTN: ATSI-CTD-CS
1 USA Intelligence Ctr & Sch, Ft Huachuca, ATTN: DAS/SRD
1 USA Intelligence Ctr & Sch, Ft Huachuca, ATTN: ATSI-TEM
1 USA Intelligence Ctr & Sch, Ft Huachuca, ATTN: Library
1 CDR, HQ Ft Huachuca, ATTN: Tech Ref Div
2 CDR, USA Electronic Prvg Grd, ATTN: STEEP-MT-S
1 CDR, Project MASSTER, ATTN: Tech Info Center
1 Hq MASSTER, USATRADOC, LNO
1 Research Institute, HQ MASSTER, Ft Hood
1 USA Recruiting Cmd, Ft Sherdian, ATTN: USARCPM-P
1 Senior Army Adv., USAFAGOD/TAC, Elgin AF Aux Fld No. 9
1 HQ USARPAC, DCSPER, APO SF 96558, ATTN: GPPE-SE
1 Stimson Lib, Academy of Health Sciences, Ft Sam Houston
1 Marine Corps Inst., ATTN: Dean-MCI
1 HQUSMC, Commandant, ATTN: Code MTMT 51
1 HQUSMC, Commandant, ATTN: Code MPI-20
2 USCG Academy, New London, ATTN: Admission
2 USCG Academy, New London, ATTN: Library
1 USCG Training Ctr, NY, ATTN: CO
1 USCG Training Ctr, NY, ATTN: Educ Svc Ofc
1 USCG, Psychol Res Br, DC, ATTN: GP 1/62
1 HQ Mid-Range Br, MC Det, Quantico, ATTN: P&S Div

1 US Marine Corps Liaison Ofc, AMC, Alexandria, ATTN: AMCGS-F
1 USATRADOC, Ft Monroe, ATTN: ATRO-ED
6 USATRADOC, Ft Monroe, ATTN: ATPR-AD
1 USATRADOC, Ft Monroe, ATTN: ATTS-EA
1 USA Forces Cmd, Ft McPherson, ATTN: Library
2 USA Aviation Test Bd, Ft Rucker, ATTN: STEBG-PO
1 USA Agcy for Aviation Safety, Ft Rucker, ATTN: Library
1 USA Agcy for Aviation Safety, Ft Rucker, ATTN: Educ Advisor
1 USA Aviation Sch, Ft Rucker, ATTN: PO Drawer O
1 HQUSA Aviation Sys Cmd, St Louis, ATTN: AMSAV-ZDR
2 USA Aviation Sys Test Act., Edwards AFB, ATTN: SAVTE-T
1 USA Air Def Sch, Ft Bliss, ATTN: ATSA TEM
1 USA Air Mobility Rsch & Dev Lab, Moffett Fld, ATTN: SAVDL-AS
1 USA Aviation Sch, Res Tng Mgt, Ft Rucker, ATTN: ATST-T-RTM
1 USA Aviation Sch, CO, Ft Rucker, ATTN: ATST-D-A
1 HQ, DARCOM, Alexandria, ATTN: AMXCD-TL
1 HQ, DARCOM, Alexandria, ATTN: CDR
1 US Military Academy, West Point, ATTN: Serials Unit
1 US Military Academy, West Point, ATTN: Ofc of Milt Ldrshp
1 US Military Academy, West Point, ATTN: MAOR
1 USA Standardization Gp, UK, FPO NY, ATTN: MASE-GC
1 Ofc of Naval Rsch, Arlington, ATTN: Code 452
3 Ofc of Naval Rsch, Arlington, ATTN: Code 458
1 Ofc of Naval Rsch, Arlington, ATTN: Code 450
1 Ofc of Naval Rsch, Arlington, ATTN: Code 441
1 Naval Aerospc Med Res Lab, Pensacola, ATTN: Acous Sch Div
1 Naval Aerospc Med Res Lab, Pensacola, ATTN: Code L31
1 Naval Aerospc Med Res Lab, Pensacola, ATTN: Code L5
1 Chief of NavPers, ATTN: Pers-OR
1 NAVAIRSTA, Norfolk, ATTN: Safety Ctr
1 Nav Oceanographic, DC, ATTN: Code 6251, Charts & Tech
1 Center of Naval Anal, ATTN: Doc Ctr
1 NavAirSysCom, ATTN: AIR-5313C
1 Nav BuMed, ATTN: 713
1 NavHelicopterSubSqua 2, FPO SF 96601
1 AFHRL (FT) William AFB
1 AFHRL (TT) Lowry AFB
1 AFHRL (AS) WPAFB, OH
2 AFHRL (DOJZ) Brooks AFB
1 AFHRL (DOJN) Lackland AFB
1 HQUSAF (INYSD)
1 HQUSAF (DPXXA)
1 AFVTG (RD) Randolph AFB
3 AMRL (HE) WPAFB, OH
2 AF Inst of Tech, WPAFB, OH, ATTN: ENE/SL
1 ATC (XPTD) Randolph AFB
1 USAF AeroMed Lib, Brooks AFB (SUL-4), ATTN: DOC SEC
1 AFOSR (NL), Arlington
1 AF Log Cmd, McClellan AFB, ATTN: ALC/DPCRB
1 Air Force Academy, CO, ATTN: Dept of Bel Scn
5 NavPers & Dev Ctr, San Diego
2 Navy Med Neuropsychiatric Rsch Unit, San Diego
1 Nav Electronic Lab, San Diego, ATTN: Res Lab
1 Nav TrngCen, San Diego, ATTN: Code 9000-Lib
1 NavPostGraSch, Monterey, ATTN: Code 55Aa
1 NavPostGraSch, Monterey, ATTN: Code 2124
1 NavTrngEquipCtr, Orlando, ATTN: Tech Lib
1 US Dept of Labor, DC, ATTN: Manpower Admin
1 US Dept of Justice, DC, ATTN: Drug Enforce Admin
1 Nat Bur of Standards, DC, ATTN: Computer Info Section
1 Nat Clearing House for MH-Info, Rockville
1 Denver Federal Ctr, Lakewood, ATTN: BLM
12 Defense Documentation Center
4 Dir Psych, Army Hq, Russell Ofcs, Canberra
1 Scientific Advsr, Mil Bd, Army Hq, Russell Ofcs, Canberra
1 Mil and Air Attache, Austrian Embassy
1 Centre de Recherche Des Facteurs, Humaine de la Defense Nationale, Brussels
2 Canadian Joint Staff Washington
1 C/Air Staff, Royal Canadian AF, ATTN: Pers Std Anal Br
3 Chief, Canadian Def Rsch Staff, ATTN: C/CRDS(W)
4 British Def Staff, British Embassy, Washington
1 Def & Civil Inst of Enviro Medicine, Canada
1 AIR CRESS, Kensington, ATTN: Info Sys Br
1 Militaerpsykologisk Tjeneste, Copehagen
1 Military Attache, French Embassy, ATTN: Doc Sec
1 Medecin Chef, C.E.R.P.A.-Arsenal, Toulon/Naval France
1 Prin Scientific Off, Appl Hum Engr Rsch Div, Ministry of Defense, New Delhi
1 Pers Rsch Ofc Library, AKA, Israel Defense Forces
1 Ministeris van Defensie, DOOP/KL Afd Sociaal Psychologische Zaken, The Hague, Netherlands

21